

shoes. Just like anybody else, he will have to get his cleats the old-fashioned way. He will have to earn them. That is the way it will be.

Mr. President, we bid farewell to a man who has brought so much respect and so much quality to the University of Montana and the football program, and we say goodbye, but we do not say so long.

I yield the floor.

PROGRESS TOWARD A BAN ON ANTIPERSONNEL LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to bring Senators up to date on the progress of the past 2 months since the Leahy amendment for a moratorium on the use of antipersonnel landmines was signed into law.

That amendment received bipartisan support from about two-thirds of the Senate. It was supported by the House-Senate conference committee, and it was signed by the President on February 12. I want to thank all those Senators who voted for it. I would also like to thank those Senators who have come up to me since the vote who did not vote for it and said now they wished they had because of the havoc that the mines have wreaked in Bosnia.

In fact, in Bosnia just since December, 38 NATO soldiers have been injured, 7 have been killed by landmines, including 3 Americans. There are 3 million landmines left in Bosnia. To put that in perspective, there are 3 million landmines in a country about the size of Tennessee. They will kill and maim civilians for decades after our troops leave. Children going to school, farmers working in their fields, and people going to market will be dying long after most of us have left the U.S. Senate.

Over the past several years, I have sponsored legislation against antipersonnel landmines. The purpose of my legislation has been to exert United States leadership so that pressure would build on other countries to follow our example. During a lot of that time this was seen as some kind of a crusade of civilians against the military. It was never the case. It was never intended by me to be the case. In fact, one of the greatest encouragements I had in my efforts to ban landmines was the support I received from combat veterans around this country.

Those who say we need antipersonnel landmines should read the April 3 full-page open letter to President Clinton that appeared in the New York Times. In this full-page letter to the President, 15 of the country's most distinguished retired military officers called for a ban on the production, the sale, the transfer, and the use of antipersonnel landmines. They say such a ban would be both "humane and militarily responsible."

Look at some of the people who signed this. These are not just wild-eyed theorists. They include Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf; former Chairman of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. David Jones; the former Supreme Allied Commander, Gen. John Galvin; former Commander in Chief of the U.S. Southern Command, Gen. Frederick Woerner; former Commanding General, U.S. Readiness Command, Gen. Volney Warner. Mr. President, these are generals who know what has happened.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the generals' letter be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LEAHY. There is no doubt that antipersonnel landmines have some use. Any weapon does. But to those who would argue that whatever use they have outweighs the devastation they inflict on whole societies, I would answer that the commanders of our forces in South Korea, Vietnam, NATO, and Desert Storm say otherwise.

They say we can get rid of these landmines. These generals have used antipersonnel landmines and have seen what they do. They say these indiscriminate weapons made their jobs more dangerous, not safer. They remember their troops being blown up by their own minefields.

Today, it is landmines that our troops fear the most in Bosnia. No army is going to challenge our men and women in Bosnia, but there are hidden killers everywhere. A \$2 antipersonnel mine will blow the leg off the best-trained, the best-equipped, the best-motivated American soldier.

In the 2 months since February, Canada, the Netherlands, Australia and, yesterday, Germany, have announced they will unilaterally, effective immediately, ban their use of antipersonnel landmines. These countries have gone way out ahead of the United States in showing leadership to ban landmines. Several, like Germany, said they will destroy their stockpile of these weapons. They are taking this action, which far surpasses what the United States has done, to lead the rest of the world.

Mr. President, next Monday, the United States will join over 50 countries in Geneva in the final session of negotiations on a treaty to limit the use of antipersonnel landmines. We already know that any agreement is going to fall far short of what is needed to solve this problem. Countries have insisted on exceptions and loopholes that are just going to assure that landmines will continue to maim and kill innocent civilians for decades to come.

In the weeks of negotiations there have not been more than 2 minutes of discussion on the banning of these weapons—the simplest and easiest thing to do, and what all of these distinguished retired American generals asked us to do. The only way we are going to get rid of antipersonnel landmines is by leadership that energizes the rest of the world.

A year and a half ago in a historic speech at the United Nations, President Clinton declared the goal of rid-

ding the world of antipersonnel landmines.

There is no reason why today, with the world's attention focused on Bosnia, where we are spending tens of millions of dollars just to try to find the mines, we cannot join with our NATO partners, who have gone way out ahead of the United States, and renounce these insidious weapons. Let the United States—the most powerful nation on Earth—instead of being a follower in this, become the leader. A law we voted for in the Senate, now on the books, says we will halt our use of these landmines in 3 years. It should happen immediately, and it should be permanent, as Germany, Canada, and the others have done. Our senior retired combat officers support it. Hundreds of humanitarian organizations support it. They have seen the limbs torn off children at the knee.

If I have anything to do with it—and I intend to—this country is going to end this century having banned these terrible weapons once and for all. I hope the President and his administration will do what the United States Senate has already done—shown leadership in this. I hope that the rest of the Congress will do that, and then I hope that the United States will come back into a leadership role in banning landmines. It is what our NATO allies want, it is what our retired generals want, and it is what our men and women in the Armed Forces want.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article in the April 8 edition of Newsweek magazine, by David Hackworth, America's most decorated soldier, entitled, "One Weapon We Don't Need," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Apr. 8, 1996]

ONE WEAPON WE DON'T NEED

(By David H. Hackworth)

Last February, Sgt. 1/C Donald A. Dugan was killed instantly on a snowy patch of ground in Bosnia. An antipersonnel mine exploded while the veteran U.S. Army reconnaissance sergeant was attempting to disarm it. The explosion drove a piece of the steel disarming tool into his forehead. On a dozen different killing fields around the world in the past 50 years, I've seen thousands of soldiers and civilians blasted apart by landmines. In northern Italy, where I served as a 15-year-old soldier boy at the end of World War II, I saw an army captain's legs ripped off by a land mine. In Bosnia last January, I came within minutes of becoming a casualty myself from a land-mine explosion. But I've never seen a battle in which land mines made a difference to the outcome. They are ugly and ineffective weapons, and they ought to be outlawed.

Land mines are indiscriminate killers. They kill not only during the conflict, but decades after the last shot was fired. The technology has improved; a modern mine can be programmed to blow itself up after a few weeks or months, reducing the postwar threat to civilians. But anti-personnel mines are still not "smart." They can't tell a good guy from a bad guy, a soldier from a civilian, an adult from a child. And some fail to blow themselves up. When millions of mines are

scattered across a battlefield by air and artillery, even a tiny "dud rate" will leave a substantial number lying in wait for innocent victims.

Of all the instruments of terror used on the battlefield, mines are the most inhumane. The wartime casualties are young men whose lives are either snuffed out or ruined forever by crippling injuries. Even soldiers who escape from a minefield unscathed are haunted by the experience. Many cases of posttraumatic stress disorder, a serious psychological malady, were caused by the preying fear of mines and booby traps. Years later, a walk across an open field bring back the old dread: What's under those leaves? Do I dare put my foot on that freshly turned earth? Walk through a minefield, and you'll never be young again.

During the Korean War, tens of thousands of soldiers on both sides were felled by land mines. Many of them were killed by their own mines, recklessly thrown down in haste, their location unrecorded. In 1952, as a 21-year-old lieutenant, I was ordered to clear a path through an unmapped minefield—one of our own. I argued with my colonel about the advisability of doing such work on frozen, snow-covered ground. Lieutenants seldom win disputes with colonels, so the mine-clearing detail proceeded as ordered until a fine black sergeant named Simmons tripped the wire on a "Bouncing Betty" mine. It popped up from the ground and blew off the top of his head, covering me with his blood and brains. Moments later, another noncom went nuts and stomped out into the minefield, screaming: "I'll find the f----- mines, I'll find the f----- mines!" He was tackled, restrained and led away.

In Vietnam, the U.S. Armed Forces also used land mines irresponsibly, dropping millions of them at random by air. The enemy quickly learned how to disarm these weapons and recycle them for use against us. The infantry battalion I commanded in the Ninth Division took more than 1,800 casualties in a year and a half, most of them caused by recycled U.S. ordnance. Mines cannot secure a flank or defend a position by themselves. For a minefield to be even marginally effective, it must be protected by friendly troops, to knock off the bad guys who want to clear a path or use the mines against you.

Mines never stopped any unit of mine from taking its objective—or the enemy from getting inside my wire. Anyone who has ever been in battle, especially in Korea or Vietnam, has seen enemy sappers crawl through mines and barbed wire and get into their positions. I once faced a Chinese "human wave" attack in Korea. My company was dug in on high ground, with plenty of weapons, ammo and artillery support. Out in front of our position we laid a carpet of mines and flares. The enemy attacked in regimental strength, outnumbering us 9 to 1. They walked through our minefield—and our gunfire—without missing a beat. They cut my company in half and within an hour were two miles to the south, in our rear. The only way out was to move north, so we trudged through our own somewhat depleted minefield to escape, losing two men in the process.

Most serving generals especially the desk jockeys, are in favor of mines. The real warfighters usually want to get rid of them. Whatever defensive punch is lost would be more than offset by the new firearms and missiles that give today's infantry platoon more killing power than a Korea-vintage battalion. "Mines are not mission-essential," says one general, "but they are budget-essential." In 1996, the U.S. Army budgeted \$89 million for land-mine warfare. Now the army is fighting to protect every nickel.

Still, some retired generals want to ban mines, and I agree with them. Governments

can declare land mines illegal, just as chemical weapons were prohibited. Sure, thugs like Saddam Hussein or Ratko Mladic will continue to use them. But users (along with manufacturers and dealers) can be hunted down and punished by an international court. If that happens just a few times, antipersonnel mines will go the way of mustard gas. I'll drink to that, and so will most veterans of foreign wars.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, let me say one last time that we can ban landmines. We can ban landmines certainly within this century. We can ban them if the most powerful nation on Earth, the United States, takes the leadership role that it must in this. If we do what so many other countries have already done, and if we, instead of following them, step out ahead of them, we can ban these landmines once and for all. If we do, our men and women, when sent into harm's way, will be safer. Our humanitarian workers will be safer, and millions of children and innocent civilians around the world will become safer.

I yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1996]

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT CLINTON

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We understand that you have announced a United States goal of the eventual elimination of antipersonnel landmines. We take this to mean that you support a permanent and total international ban on the production, stockpiling, sale and use of this weapon.

We view such a ban as not only humane, but also militarily responsible.

The rationale for opposing antipersonnel landmines is that they are in a category similar to poison gas; they are hard to control and often have unintended harmful consequences (sometimes even for those who employ them). In addition, they are insidious in that their indiscriminate effects persist long after hostilities have ceased, continuing to cause casualties among innocent people, especially farmers and children.

We understand that: there are 100 million landmines deployed in the world. Their presence makes normal life impossible in scores of nations. It will take decades of slow, dangerous and painstaking work to remove these mines. The cost in dollars and human lives will be immense. Seventy people will be killed or maimed today, 500 this week, more than 2,000 this month, and more than 26,000 this year, because of landmines.

Given the wide range of weaponry available to military forces today, antipersonnel landmines are not essential. Thus, banning them would not undermine the military effectiveness or safety of our forces, nor those of other nations.

The proposed ban on antipersonnel landmines does not affect antitank mines, nor does it ban such normally command-detonnated weapons as Claymore "mines," leaving unimpaired the use of those undeniably militarily useful weapons.

Nor is the ban on antipersonnel landmines a slippery slope that would open the way to efforts to ban additional categories of weapons, since these mines are unique in their indiscriminate, harmful residual potential.

We agree with and endorse these views, and conclude that you as Commander-in-Chief could responsibly take the lead in efforts to achieve a total and permanent international ban on the production, stockpiling, sale and use of antipersonnel landmines. We strongly urge that you do so.

General David Jones (USAF; ret.), former Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff;
General John R. Galvin (US Army, ret.), former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe;
General H. Norman Schwarzkopf (US Army, ret.), Commander, Operation Desert Storm;
General William G.T. Tuttle, Jr. (US Army, ret.), former Commander, US Army Materiel Command;
General Volney F. Warner (US Army, ret.), former Commanding General, US Readiness Command;
General Frederick F. Woerner, Jr. (US Army, ret.), former Commander-in-Chief, US Southern Command;
Lieutenant General James Abrahamson (USAF, ret.), former Director, Strategic Defense Initiative Office;
Lieutenant General Henry E. Emerson (US Army, ret.), former Commander, XVIII Airborne Corps;
Lieutenant General Robert G. Gard, Jr. (US Army, ret.), former President, National Defense University, President, Monterey Institute of International Studies;
Lieutenant General James F. Hollingsworth (US Army, ret.), former I Corps (ROK/US Group);
Lieutenant General Harold G. Moore, Jr. (US Army, ret.), former Commanding General, 7th Infantry Division;
Lieutenant General Dave R. Palmer (US Army, ret.), former Commandant, US Military Academy, West Point;
Lieutenant General DeWitt C. Smith, Jr. (US Army, ret.), former Commandant, US Army War College;
Vice Admiral Jack Shanahan (USN, ret.), former Commander, US Second Fleet;
Brigadier General Douglas Kinnard (US Army, ret.), former Chief of Military History, US Army.

SEXUAL OFFENDER TRACKING AND IDENTIFICATION ACT

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I have introduced The Sexual Offender Tracking and Identification Act of 1996 with Senators Biden, Hutchinson, and Faircloth. I would like, this morning, to talk a little bit about this bill, its origins and what it seeks to do.

I begin by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of endorsement from the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CENTER FOR MISSING
& EXPLOITED CHILDREN,
Arlington, VA, April 16, 1996.

To: Senator Phil Gramm.

From: Teresa Klingsmith, Manager, Legislative Affairs.

Date: April 16, 1996.

Re Necessity of Sexual Predators Tracking and Identification Act of 1996.

The benefit of a national sex offender registry network and database, such as the one envisioned in your bill, cannot be overstated. As we see the effects of the mandates contained in the Wetterling Act—presently 47 states have sex offender registry programs—we are made cognizant of the new obstacles to be tackled with regard to sex offender containment. It is time for the next steps contemplated but not attended to in Wetterling.